

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending. The title of the invention has been amended. No new matter is presented.

The title was objected to for lack of descriptiveness. The title has been amended, and Applicant requests withdrawal of this objection.

Claims 1-34 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Salgado, U.S. Patent 5,777,882, and Hasegawa, U.S. Patent 5,534,974. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserts that Salgado teaches a messaging unit for outputting the message corresponding to the sending source when the controller detects that the sending source has been registered (citing col. 12, lines 1-6). Upon review of this portion of Salgado, it appears that the Examiner is mistaken. Salgado, at col. 12, lines 1-6, states that each mailbox can be frequently checked for reassignment of that bin to a new user. This does not relate in any way to what is claimed. Salgado is merely disclosing that it can be determined if a bin is empty and if that is the case, the bin assignments can be changed. No message is output which corresponds to the sending source when the controller detects that the sending source has been registered. Accordingly, Salgado fails to teach or suggest this feature.

The Examiner further admits that Salgado fails to teach that the print job contains information indicative of a sending source and an output destination, but argues that it would have been obvious to modify Salgado in light of the teachings in Hasegawa to include this feature “because such a modification would increase the efficiency of the system when allowing the user can [sic] deliver the print job to his desired location.” However, Salgado is directed to a system in which the user has an assigned mailbox bin, thus the identification of which user has sent the print job is all that is needed to direct the print job to the correct mailbox bin. This ensures the print job will be delivered to the desired location. It would be totally unnecessary to further include information about the output destination in the print job because the purpose of Salgado is to assign

the mailbox bin before the print job is sent. Adding this additional bit of information would not add any value to the system of Salgado. Thus, there would not have been any motivation to combine Salgado and Hasegawa as suggested by the Examiner.

Accordingly, the features of claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Salgado, Hasegawa or a combination thereof. Further, there would have been no motivation to combine Salgado and Hasegawa as stated above.

Claim 2 is allowable for the same reasons claim 1 is allowable, and further due to its dependency.

Claim 3 recites the same features discussed above in connection with claim 1, and is therefore allowable for the same reasons.

Claims 4-10 are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies.

Claim 11 recites selecting a message from among a plurality of messages preregistered for a plurality of output destinations, said selection being done based on the output destination information contained in the print job to be executed. As stated above, Salgado does not teach that the output destination is part of the print job and there would not have been any motivation to combine the references to create the claimed printing system.

Claim 12 is also allowable for the reasons discussed above. Claims 13-16 are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies.

Claim 17 recites some of the same features discussed above in connection with claim 1 and is allowable for the same reasons. Furthermore, claim 17 recites that the printer is instructed to print when the sending source is registered. By implication, if the sending source is not registered, the print job will not be completed. The Examiner asserts that this feature is taught by Hasegawa. However, there would have been no motivation to modify Salgado in light of Hasegawa for the reasons set forth above. Namely, before the print job is sent in Salgado, the bin is assigned to a

user. Thus, it is not necessary to actually check to see if the sending source is registered because that is already preset and thus it will be assumed that the source is registered. This would add no value to Salgado.

Claims 18-31 are allowable at least due their respective dependencies. Claim 32 is allowable for the same reasons claim 17 is allowable. Claim 34 is allowable at least due to its dependency from claim 32.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 325772015300.

Dated: March 2, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Deborah S. Gladstein

Registration No.: 43,636  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(703) 760-7753